

For Office Use Only

Figure 1 consists of three panels labeled (a), (b), and (c). Panel (a) is a 2x4 grid of plots. The top row is labeled 'Y' and the bottom row is labeled 'M'. The columns are labeled '1', '2', '3', and '4'. Each plot contains a grid of smaller plots, representing replicates. Panel (b) shows two plots side-by-side, labeled 'Batch'. Panel (c) shows a single plot labeled 'Report'.

2. Name of Permittee B E A T L O C K C O A L C O		9. MSHA Number 4 2 5 0 1 2 7 0		10. Date of Inspection Y. Y. M. M. D. D. 9 1 0 3 2 8	
3. Street Address 2 0 3 0 X W I S E R		11. State Permit Number 4 2 5 0 1 2 7 0			
4. City 2 0 3 0 X		12. Name of Mine 2 0 3 0 X			
5. State 2 0 3 0 X		13. County Code 0 1			
6. Zip Code 0 4 5 6 7		7. Area Code 0 0 1		8. Telephone Number 0 5 2 5 0 5 0	
17. OSM Field Office No. 0 2		18. OSM Area Office No. 0 2		19. OSM Sample No. 0 2 3 4	
20. Type of Inspection (Code) 0 1		21. Joint Inspection Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		22. Inspector's ID No. 3 7 6	
23. Status A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Permit B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mine Status (Code) C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Facility (Code) D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Number of Permitted Acres E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Number of Disturbed Acres		24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes) A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steep Slope E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anthracite B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mountain Top Removal F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Lands C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prime Farmlands G <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indian Lands D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alluvial Valley Floors H <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other			
25. Performance Standards (Codes)					
Instructions: Indicate compliance code. For any standard marked 2 or 3 provide narrative to support this determination.					
Standards That Limit the Effects to the Permit Area A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distance Prohibitions B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mining Within Permit Boundaries C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Signs and Markers D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sediment Control Measures E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design and Certification Requirements—Sediment Control F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effluent Limits G <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Monitoring H <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground Water Monitoring I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Blasting Procedures J <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Haul/Access Road Design and Maintenance K <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refuse Impoundments L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Specify <u>Liability Insurance</u>			Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Topsoil Handling N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backfilling and Grading O <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Following Reclamation Schedule P <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revegetation Requirements Q <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disposal of Excess Spoil R <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highwall Elimination T <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Downslope Spoil Disposal U <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post Mining Land Use V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cessation of Operations Temporary W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		

Beaver Creek Coal Co.
P.O. Box 1378
Price, UT 84501
801-637-5050

Huntington #4
ACT/015/004

Complete oversight inspection
3/28/91

Mitchell S. Rollings, 370, OSM
Bill Malencik, DOGM
Dan Guy, Beaver Creek

This was a complete, random sample, oversight inspection conducted with both an RA and company representative. The records were reviewed on March 26th, and the field part was done on March 28th.

The DOGM permit was issued 4/30/90, and expires 4/30/95. The site is reclaimed and had a Phase I bond release in November of 1986. The current bond is with United Pacific Insurance Co., #U630694, for \$144,041 and is valid until released or forfeited.

The UPDES permit, #UTG023116, has been "inactivated" by the Division of Environmental Health. AFO will send a letter to the Division of Environmental Health requesting clarification on why the permit was invalidated prior to Phase II bond release, especially in light of the fact that the outfall still exists.

The water monitoring schedule requires biannual sampling for water quality and monthly gauging of flows. The five locations have been monitored as required for the last year. The SPCC is current also. The required vegetation study was done in 1989. The subsidence monitoring was last done in 1989 also. Further subsidence monitoring has been suspended for now.

The quarterly pond inspections have been done for the last year; 10, 8, 5(2), and 2/90. The annual pond certification was done on 11/19/90.

TDL 91-02-370-005 TV1 is issued for failure to have adequate liability insurance. The liability insurance is with CIGNA with a policy period of 1/1/90 through 1/1/93. The limit is two million. A problem exists with this policy in that it covers "Atlantic Richfield Company, its Subsidiaries and subsidiaries thereof as now or hereinafter constituted...Including Beaver Creek Coal Company"

Beaver Creek Coal Co., has five permitted operations in Utah, so the policy is not adequate. The fact that this also covers all of ARCO also makes this inadequate. Upon return to AFO, Vickie Bryan, WSC, was contacted and she said that she had just finished a review of Utah liability insurance. She also came up with this mine as not meeting the requirements of the liability regulations. A minimum of

\$300,000 and \$500,000 per mine site is required by the State program regulations.

We were not able to drive all the way to the site because of the snow depth. This also made for a very limited inspection of the field conditions. Erosion, revegetation success, etc., could not be accurately assessed. I could not distinguish erosion in the upper and lower pad drainage channels nor in the reconstructed channels crossing the access road to the upper pad. The sedimentation pond 001A is a series of ponds. The upper pond spillway had eroded and been reconstructed, but I could not see any evidence of continued erosion. The lower pond discharges through a rock lined channel to a CMP under the access road and into the creek. The pipe appeared to be at least partially blocked by the snow. No violations were observed on the site.